

NOV 22 2005

File 16050-1US CMB/AA/kf

Montreal, Canada

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicants : John MARIS  
Serial Number : 10/670,780  
Filed : September 26, 2003  
Title : ELECTRONIC NON-LINEAR AIRCRAFT ALTITUDE  
AND VERTICAL SPEED DISPLAY  
Examiner : GIBSON, Eric M.  
Agent of Record : BENOÎT, C. Marc  
Telephone number : (514) 847-4462

---

Via facsimile: (703/872-9306)

**Mail Stop AF**  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria VA 22313-1450  
U.S.A

**RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION**

Sir:

This is in response to the Office action mailed September 19, 2005.

**Substance of Interview**

A phone interview was conducted with Examiner Gibson on October 24, 2005.  
The substance of interview is attached hereto.

**Amendments to the Claims** are reflected in the listing of claims which begins on  
page 2 of this paper.

**Remarks/Arguments** begin on Page 8 of this paper.

Application Number 10/670,780  
Reply to Office action of September 19, 2005

**CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the  
Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

C. Marc BENOÎT, Reg. No. 50,200  
Name of person signing certification



Signature

22 Nov. 2005

Date

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-413)

Application No. 10/670,780

Continuation of Substance of Interview Including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant gave a brief description of the invention, including the differences between the invention and the prior art. The inventive feature is the ability of the display to stretch or otherwise expand the scale of the display between the current reading and the maximum and minimum. The invention dynamically changes the calibration of scale, so that there is an exact fit in the display. The Examiner agreed that based on the description of the invention, the prior art of record does not teach the invention as explained. However, the Examiner indicated that Claim 1 is broader in scope and does not specifically claim the features that distinguish the invention as explained. The Examiner recommended that claim 1 be amended to include the features that were explained in the description of the invention. For example, the Examiner pointed to language used in allowed claims 28-30. The Examiner indicated that while any amendments including the features explained would add patentable weight to the claims, a further search and consideration would be necessary to evaluate any added limitations. Also, the applicant tried to email an exhibit that contained a demonstration of the invention. The Examiner was unable to open the file, but recommended that the applicant send the exhibit as an attachment to the next response.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY